DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 758 TM 014 867

AUTHOR Bodenhausen, Judith
TITLE Teacher Attitudes toward Peer Evaluation: What Shapes Them?
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Peer Evaluation; School Districts; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Evaluation; Unions
IDENTIFIERS *California Federation of Teachers; *California Teachers Association

ABSTRACT

Teachers from six California school districts were interviewed about their attitudes regarding peer evaluation and the reasons behind those attitudes. Three of the districts were represented by a bargaining agent for the California Federation of Teachers (CFT) and three had California Teachers Association (CTA) representation. Chosen to represent a cross-section, 15 teachers from each district were interviewed; focus was on identifying teachers who might be expected to be active in their teacher unions and who might have influence on the views of their colleagues/peers. For each district and for each question from the semi-structured interview schedule, a mean response was computed. A mean for all districts and the standard deviation of those means were then calculated. The district means were tested for significance differences from that composite mean. Results indicate that: teachers would be more open to peer review if the structure of evaluation was changed from the present structure; teachers represented by the CTA tended to be more distrustful of administration; professionalism is a real interest of many teachers, particularly those not nearing retirement; and opposition to peer review is no longer the monolith of years past. In general, when teachers have no access to peer evaluation, they tend to be opposed to the idea. Interview questions are included. (TJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED319758

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JUDITH BODENHAUSEN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Teacher Attitudes Toward Peer Evaluation: What Shapes Them?

by

Judith Bodenhausen
University of California Berkeley

Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association
Boston, April 16-20, 1990

TM 014867

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Part of being a teacher is putting up with duties and routines which not only contribute little toward one's primary task of educating students but which also detract from that task by absorbing time and energy. Certainly patroling halls, keeping attendance records, and collecting lunch money fall into this category. But, for many educators, activities ostensibly intended to contribute to the teaching process actually detract from it. Substantial numbers of teachers, for example, do not consider inservice education, school accreditation, and performance evaluation to be aids to professional growth; rather, they find them little more than impositions to be endured.

Performance evaluation is an annual or semi-annual ritual for probationary teachers; for those with tenure, it occurs annually or even on a bi- or trienniel cycle. For all but those deemed seriously in trouble, it is rarely much more than a cursory inspection of classroom activities. While lip service is paid to using evaluation to improve instruction, many, if not most, teachers feel it seldom fulfills this function.

Because in the heirarchical structure of K-12 education evaluation has always been an administrative function, teachers historically have accepted none of the responsibility for its generally poor quality. Publically, they rue the failure of administrators to evaluate properly and, if necessary, remove incompetent teachers. Privately, their leaders admit that this ineffectiveness of evaluation can work to their unions' advantage. Teachers' grumbling about evaluation hassles can be countered with generic or specific attacks on administrators; public dissatisfaction with poor teachers, because it is normally unfocused, can usually be deflected. However, teachers' anger at their union for defending or, alternatively, failing to defend adequately, a teacher facing termination can too easily result in votes against those perceived responsible (individuals or the union itself) or in disaffection from the union and its activities. Furthermore, the knowledge that this same anger can become focused on an evaluator, particularly one who has recommended a termination, has contributed to the unions not

only being content to leave evaluation to administrators, but also to their actively promoting the exclusion of teachers from that process.[1]

Teachers' avoidance of the evaluator role has not precluded their trying to regulate evaluation. Their unions have lobbied numerous protections into law and bargained others into contracts. Teachers' chariness of the evaluation process has nevertheless remained, fueled by stories about and experiences with abuses: administrators' flagrant misuse of evaluation to enforce conformity, coerce sycophantic behavior, or exert hegemony, and showing, by the manner of their evaluation, that they don't know what they are talking about. Consequently, wary of inadvertently providing an administrator with amunition to use against them, teachers have rarely approached the process with the openness preequisite to reflection and growth.

In some districts, peer coaching has been used in an attempt to involve teachers in reviewing others' teaching. Although sometimes abused as a means of introducing a uniform methodology, peer coaching can be an effective means of providing teachers with a structure in which professional growth can occur. Strother (1989), in her review of peer coaching, documents that potential for effectiveness. She also notes, however, that "Most educators agree that...successful peer coaching [requires]...a clear separation from summative evaluation."

On the other hand, an important segment of reform literature considers elimination of that separation to be an important component of genuine school reform (*see, for example*, Cresswell, *et. al.*, 1980; Bacharach & Conley, 1986; Koppich, Gerritz, &. Guthrie 1986; Devaney, 1987). The literature does not elaborate on the implementation of peer evaluation.[2] In fact, it is curiously silent on peer review at the K -12 level. The two related entries in Education Index, "Peer Coaching - *See Team Teaching* " and "Peer evaluation of teachers - *See college professors and instructors - rating* ," for example, basically deny its existence.

Peer evaluation in any form exists in relatively few districts around the nation. However, for newly hired teachers and for tenured teachers in need of intervention it has been a reality in Toledo for a decade (Lawrence, 1984; Waters & Wyatt, 1985). Documenting the efficacy of peer review in that district, Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein in their seminal work (1984) recommended that teachers be directly involved in evaluation. Other districts including Rochester and Dade County have also implemented peer review, usually for these same two groups of teachers.[3]

In California, over the same decade, the larger of the state's two teacher unions, the NEA-affiliated California Teachers Association (CTA) has maintained an unabated opposition to peer evaluation. However, the AFT-affiliated California Federation of Teachers (CFT) now supports it (McDonnell & Pascal, 1988). Furthermore, the CFT has joined with the California School Boards Association to sponsor, under the auspices of Policy Analysis for California Education, a group of pilot Policy Trust Agreements.[4] In several districts, these agreements involve peer evaluation. As in Toledo, Rochester, and Dade, the evaluatees are primarily newly hired teachers; in one district, Carter, they are tenured teachers who have opted to have a peer evalutor.

Still largely unexamined, both in California and nationwide, is the average teacher's opinion of peer evaluation. Do the teachers represented by CFT differ significantly from those represented by CTA,[5] or does one union misrepresent the attitudes of the teachers it represents? Furthermore, to the extent that teachers oppose peer evaluation, is that opposition deep seated and philosophical or are Koppich, Gerritz, and Guthrie correct when they write, "We believe teachers' concerns about peer review in large measure stem from a lack of information about how a peer evaluation system would operate" (1986, p. 19).

This study was designed to begin the investigation of these questions. Teachers from six districts, three with a CFT bargaining agent and three with CTA representation,

were interviewed regarding their attitudes about peer evaluation and the reasons behind those attitudes.

Data Collection

Chosen to represent a cross-section of teachers in the district, the fifteen teachers from each district interviewed in this part of the study comprised a purposive sample. Union leaders were interviewed and then were asked for the names of union activists and of teachers active in their school but not in the union. Administrators, both central and site, were asked for the names of teachers who should be interviewed. They were specifically asked to identify teachers who are not supporters of the union and those who are influential in their school but unlikely to be identified by the union. After a list of potential interviewees was compiled, a representative (teaching level, sex, age, race, union activity level, school activity level) subsample was chosen. While, in each district, non-activist teachers were included in the interviewee group, emphasis was placed on interviewing those who might be expected to have influence on the views of their colleagues.

Semi-structured interviews were used to assess teachers' attitudes. On a series of standard questions (see Appendix A), interviewees were asked to indicate, on a scale of 1 to 5, the degree of their knowledge about peer evaluation and the strength of their attitudes toward it. Using open questions, the reasons for their attitudes and for any changes in those attitudes were explored. Both in posing the open questions and in providing clarifications for the structured questions, care was taken to refer to articles in the literature (for example, Wise *et al*, 1984; Lawrence, 1984; Waters and Wyatt, 1985; and Halkett, 1988) and to avoid mentioning organizational positions.

One of the open questions concerned interviewees' professional reading habits. In particular, note was made of whether teachers regularly read publications such as *Phi Delta Kappan*, Albert Shanker's column, "Where We Stand" in the *New York Times*,

or *Harvard Education Letter* as opposed to reading little except, perhaps, their union's newspapers.[6]

Data Analysis

For each district and for each question, a mean response was computed. A mean for all districts and the standard deviation of those means were then calculated. The district means were tested for significant difference from that composite mean. Those means are found in Table One.

Table One

Mean Response to Structured Interview Questions by District

	Question									
District	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Arthur(CTA)	1.13	1.73	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.13	3.73	3.47	3.87	3.87
Eisenhower	1.53	2.80	3.73	4.27	2.40	4.13	4.27	4.40	4.67	3.53
McKinley	2.87	2.00	2.47	3.27	1.73	2.80	3.13	3.87	3.62	3.80
Carter(CFT)	3.87	3.07	3.87	4.00	2.93	3.93	4.47	4.53	4.53	3.93
Polk	2.87	3.47	3.87	4.47	3.60	4.13	4.47	4.60	4.60	4.73
Truman	5.00	3.20	4.00	4.40	3.40	4.00	4.40	4.60	4.60	4.20
Mean	2.88	2.71	3.23	3.90	2.68	3.52	4.08	4.25	4.32	4.01
σ district	1.44	0.70	0.86	0.62	0.76	0.72	0.54	0.47	0.45	0.45

Mean responses to each question were also computed for two other groupings of interviewees: a) CTA and CFT teachers and local leaders of each union and b) regular readers of *Phi Delta Kappan*, Albert Shanker's column, "Where We Stand" in the *New York Times*, or *Harvard Education Letter* and those who rarely read anything but their union's newspapers. Those means are presented in Tables Two and Three.

Table Two

Mean Union Leadership Response to Structured Interview Questions
Mean Response to Structured Interview Questions by CTA and CFT Teachers

	Question									
Union	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
CTA leaders	2.50	1.83	2.33	2.5	1.33	1.83	2.83	2.83	3.00	4.33
CFT leaders	4.6	4.4	4.8	5	4.4	5	5	5	5	4.8
CTA districts	1.84	2.18	2.73	3.51	2.04	3.02	3.71	3.91	4.05	3.73
CFT districts	3.91	3.91	3.91	4.29	3.31	4.02	4.45	4.58	4.51	4.29

Table Three

Mean Responses to Structured Interview Questions by Readers/Non-readers
of *Phi Delta Kappan*, the *New York Times* and the *Harvard Education Letter*

Question

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Readers	4.40	3.80	4.40	4.80	3.60	4.00	4.60	4.80	4.80	3.60
Non-readers	2.67	1.83	2.33	2.83	1.67	1.83	3.33	3.83	3.83	4.67

The responses to to individual questions were examined to see what additional information resulted from analyzing pairs or trios of questions. Next, the responses to the open-ended questions were analyzed. Trends which might partially explain group differences were sought. An effort was made to isolate factors which might facilitate the implementation of peer review as well as those which might serve as barriers to that implementation. Interviewees with direct experience with peer evaluation were asked to comment on that experience. In addition, Carter teachers who had participated in that district's peer evaluation pilot, but who were not interviewees, were asked for comments about that experience. Those comments appear in Appendix B.

Results

While, due to the number of groups and to the relatively small range of possible responses, none of the mean question responses for a district or a group were significantly different from the mean ($\alpha = .05$)[7] for that question, an examination of response patterns does show clear trends. Both CTA and CFT teachers basically agree with the position of their own organization. Teachers in CTA districts were definitely less open to peer evaluation than were teachers in CFT districts. Furthermore, the magnitude of the difference was somewhat camouflaged by the summary nature of the statistics. The responses of the several teachers in CFT districts who identified themselves as ardent CTA supporters were typical of those of other CTA teachers; however, they contributed to the statistics for the CFT districts. Also, the leadership of the

Eisenhower CTA, the mean responses of which were closer to those of the CFT districts than to those of the other CTA districts, indicated that their chapter was relatively independent of CTA.

In both unions, the responses of the leadership were closer to those espoused by the state union than were those of the teachers they represent. The CTA leadership was substantially less open to peer evaluation than was its membership. Again, Eisenhower was atypical. The attitudess of its leaders were similar to those of other Eisenhower teachers. The views of CFT's local leadership were also not those of its teachers. However, the difference was in the opposite direction. The leaders were more optimistic about peer review than were the rank-and-filers. This may be because all of the leaders, but relatively few of the others had been to CFT QuEST[8] workshops featuring presentations on the Toledo and Rochester peer review plans.

The difference between the responses of readers of publications such as *Phi Delta Kappan*,[9] the *New York Times* and the *Harvard Education Letter* and of those who rarely read professional publications other than their union's newspaper was also striking. CTA members who were interested in exploring peer evaluation often commented that their interest had been piqued by reading one of these publications. On the other hand, their counterparts in the CFT generally credited their willingness to consider peer evaluation to CFT efforts to inform teachers about school reform and to create an openness to its various elements.

Responses to questions 1 and 10 broke the pattern seen in the other eight questions. The two districts with the highest mean responses to question 1 have begun some piloting of peer evaluation, although neither district has given much publicity to the effort. The two with the lowest responses have neither pilot nor effort to create interest in changing evaluation. The other two districts fall in the middle. Both the union and the district in Polk are attempting to arouse an interest in changing current

evaluation procedures. McKinley has two programs which some interviewees considered to be peer evaluation: a panel evaluation option (unfamiliar to many of its teachers) that requires one panel member to be a teacher and an "Elements of Instruction" program which uses teachers to "evaluate" whether their colleagues are using it correctly. The relative unpopularity of that program may explain part of McKinley teachers' general aversion to peer review. Answers to question 10 show that union activists, regardless of union, were more likely than non-activists to blame administration for permitting incompetent teachers to continue teaching.

Questions 2, 3, 5 and 6 can be grouped in two different ways. When 2 and 3 and 5 and 6, respectively, are paired, a less positive response to the first question which is tied to the current evaluation procedure is found than to the second which is more open ended. When 2 is paired with 5, no obvious patterns present themselves. However pairing 3 with 6 makes it obvious that fear of having to evaluate teachers who should have been provided substantial assistance or dismissed early in their careers, but were not, is a major factor in making teachers hesitant about peer evaluation. The strength of the responses to question 4 indicates that to the extent that peer review can be a force in helping those who usually need help, beginners and those in serious difficulty, most teachers are willing to consider it.

Questions 7, 8, and 9 tie peer review to the professionalization of teaching. While, as noted below, some interviewees were leery that professionalization may be an empty promise and others inbdicated that it wasn't a sufficient lure to make them willing to consort with management, most interviewees were willing to put any reservations aside if the reward was the professionalization of teaching.

Discussion

The results of this introductory study lend credence to several notions. Across districts, teachers would be more open to peer review if the structure of evaluation

were different than it is presently. Elucidative comments indicate that teachers don't think a system in which someone observes them teach for a couple of hours a year has much potential for improving instruction. They would be more willing to participate in a program which they believe could help them improve their teaching. Comments from Carter teachers are instructive in this regard:

> "Because my evaluator was a peer, I found it much easier to hear constructive criticism. I learned more from this evaluation than I did all the evaluations for the last 20 years."
>
> "Peer evaluation...enables the evaluator to see alternate ways of teaching...leads to improvement by way of peer suggestions and comments."
>
> "I enjoyed being a part of the peer evaluation process because the encouragement and suggestions I received from my evaluators were insightful and to-the-point...."

Teachers would also be more open to peer evaluation if they did not fear having to evaluate colleagues who, in their view, should have been dismissed years ago. Many made comments to the effect that, "*They* got paid to evaluate *those* people and didn't -- why should *I* take the heat?"

Second, to the extent that these teachers and these locals are representative of CTA and CFT in general, the two unions *do* represent different populations of teachers. Interviewee comments indicate that, to some extent, the unions created those population differences. In the past, both CTA and CFT attempted to create a "we-they" mentality in their members. CTA's tactics in this regard have not changed.[10] Teachers represented by CTA tended to be distrustful of administration. This was so true that those giving a low response to questions 7 - 9 often made a remark to the effect that they considered professionalization to be a hoax. They firmly believed either that teachers already are professionals and that the reform movement just wants to load them with more responsibility or that, in reality, nothing would change except the amount of work that they do. Unless they were readers of some publication that often discusses school reform, the views of most CTA teachers reflected an attitude that teachers have nothing

to gain and much to lose by participating in peer evaluation. In addition to perceived disadvantages already mentioned, CTA members felt those losses would include less union cohesiveness in the face of an unabated management effort to weaken the union.[11]

That the populations are different was also evidenced by the nature of the resistance to peer evaluation by the CFT nay-sayers. These individuals, whose opposition tended to be almost rabid, were not so much distrustful of administration as they were ideologically opposed to narrowing the gap between workers and management. They felt that to do so would be to contaminate workers.[12] The majority of the CFT teachers, however, indicated that CFT had been somewhat successful in its efforts to ease members away from knee-jerk anti-administrationism and in allaying their fears of school reform. These teachers were willing to consider peer review and to refrain from prejudgement.

Third, professionalism is a real interest of many teachers, particularly of those not nearing retirment.[13] It is the kind of carrot that can overcome fears and reservations. Most teachers who were enthusiastic about the prospect of peer evaluation saw it as a part of professionalizing teaching. Without the entire package, few teachers indicated a willingness to take on the onus of recommending that a colleague be dismissed. This would imply that those who want teachers to police their own ranks, but are unwilling to grant them control of their professional lives are likely to continue to hear some version of, "We didn't hire them; it's not our responsibility to fire them." Those who prefer to see only limited changes in the current structure of schooling should also be aware that several teachers who had already become involved in the professionalization of teaching mentioned that the provision of sufficient time would be a prerequisite for their participation in peer evaluation. Carter teachers who had been a part of the pilot mentioned that one of their biggest problems was finding sufficient time for conferences and write-ups.

The unstructured questions uncovered a number of other threads of commonality. Many teachers, including those willing to explore peer review, were concerned about the potential loss of collegiality. While researchers see teaching as an isolated occupation, these teachers also see themselves as colleagues. They value relationships with their peers and don't want to risk those relationships unless they gain something substantial by doing so. Carter teachers who began the peer evaluation pilot came from a department that had previously established an ethic of working constructively with one another. Furthermore, they felt that peer review strengthened those relationships.

> "After such an experience you have formed a bit of a bond with a colleague, one that allows for greater ease and frequency of conversation, more sharing at dept. meetings, a more meaningful hello in the hallway."
>
> "...peer evaluation provides a structure [to talk with colleagues about teaching]."

However, in trying to expand their pilot to other departments, they found that a major fear was having to interact professionally with colleagues who have poor interpersonal relationship skills.

About half of those generally opposed to peer evaluation conceded that for new teachers who hadn't built collegial relationships or for those whose incompetence had destroyed them, the benefits of a Toledo-type program probably outweighed the risks. Most of these were willing to see it tried as long as it did not involve them. In addition, the attitude that "peer evaluation would be OK if I didn't have to participate" also seemed to be present in some of the interviewees who answered questions generally negatively.

Two groups of teachers tended to be interested in peer evaluation for themselves: those who are actively seeking to grow professionally and those who don't like the administrative evaluation in their district (or the administrator who evaluates them). Those who were comfortable with the way they teach and found current administrative evaluation to be non-threatening

were not at all intetrested in it for themselves. Furthermore, they were more likely than others in their district to be firm in their opposition to peer review in general.

Finally, factors identified by Carter teachers involved in peer evaluation and by union leaders in all six districts as being important considerations incuded the following:

• Crowded conditions and participation in experimental programs had accustomed Carter teachers to being observed by other teachers. However, teachers who are used to teaching with their doors closed may be unfortable when they first open them;

• Rank-and-file union members may be uncomfortable with the union changing a long-held position;

• Where teachers have total control of their own preparation time, they do not want to create any precedent of the district being able to control that time;

• In California, there is a statutory prohibition of members of the teacher's bargaining unit having any evaluation responsibility.[14] Because some major education lobbies continue to try to eliminate or substantially reduce collective bargaining, few union leaders are willing to risk supporting any amendment to the Rodda Act, the basic collective bargaining statute;

• Not all those fearing peer evaluation are teachers. While few teachers were concerned that successful institution of peer evaluation would change the roles of administrators, it was felt to be an important consideration;

• The fiction of teachers being pedagogically equal, to which teachers normally have paid public lip service, as well as their stance that many of the problems of the school are not their responsibility would be strained by peer review, perhaps to the breaking point. Not all teachers are comfortable with this;

• Teachers participating in peer review felt less threatened by evaluation; they learned both as evaluator and evaluatee; evaluation began to inform teaching;

• Seeing that colleagues also had weaknesses helped some individuals;

• No longer constrained by a need for district-wide uniformity, in the Carter pilot, evalution was more tailored to the needs of individual teachers.

Conclusion

Wise and his colleagues write, "...the system [of evaluation] can either reinforce the idea of teaching as a profession, or it can further deprofessionalize teaching..." (1984, p. *v*). If peer review is, in fact, an element of professionalism, then it is essential for those interested in the professionalization of teaching to establish peer review. This research demonstrates that opposition to peer evaluation is no longer the monolith of years past; its strength varies, depending on a variety of other factors. Koppich, Gerritz, and Guthrie are both correct and incorrect in their conjecture about the nature of the opposition to peer review (1986, p. 19). In some cases, fears about and resistance to peer review have their roots in ignorance. In some, they arise from burn out or from philosophical considerations. However, in others they grow out of a concern that real problems are not being confronted.

When teachers have no access to the potential of peer evaluation, they tend to be opposed. When an effort is made to educate them as to how it can work, fears are allayed, opposition dissipates, and interest is piqued. A path is there for those who wish to use it.

Appendix A
Structured Interview Questions

1. Are you familiar with instances in which teachers are involved in the evaluation of other teachers?

2. Given the evaluation procedure currently used in your district, do you believe that, if provided with sufficient release time, teachers could take over all or part of the responsibility for evaluation?

3. Under a different evaluation structure, do you believe it would be possible?

4. In Toledo, Ohio, selected teachers provide substantial assistance for newly hired teachers and for teachers that both the union and the district believe are in imminent danger of dismissal. They also evaluate these teachers. The teacher-evaluators not only must provide the teachers with whom they work far more help than most new (or potential dismissee) teachers ever receive, they must also document that help and the progress of the evaluatee to a Board composed half of teachers and half of administrators that both oversees the help/evaluation program and makes final decisions. Teachers who have been involved in the program, as evaluatees, as evaluators, or as colleagues of evaluatees, with few exceptions, feel that the program has improved the quality of instruction in the district. It has also increased dismissals, both of beginning and tenured teachers. Do you think such a program would have potential in your district?

5. Under the present circumstances, including the state of administrative evaluation in your district, do you believe teachers should have any of the responsibility for evaluation.

6. If teachers were explicitly not responsible for documenting dismissal evidence against any teacher hired before the onset of a teacher-evaluation program, do you believe teachers should have any of the responsibility for evaluation of the other teachers?

7. Currently teaching is considered a semi-profession. Would you be willing to have teachers accept the responsibility for evaluation and thus for maintaining professional standards in return for being accorded professional control of other aspects of teaching?

8. One aspect of profession status for an occupation is that the members of the profession assume the responsibility for assuring the competence of those who practice the profession. Does this requirement mean that if teaching is to be a profession, teachers must be evaluated by their peers?

9. If the answer to the above question turns out to be yes, are you willing to accept peer-evaluation as the norm?

10.Are incompetent teachers are rarely dismissed teaching because, in the past, administrators have not done their job as evaluators?

Appendix B

Comments by Carter Participants in Peer Evaluation Pilot

"Because my evaluator was a peer, I found it much easier to hear constructive criticism. I learned more from this evaluation than I did all the evaluations for the last 20 years."

"Peer evaluation leads to communication among department members which is something to be desired...enables the evaluator to see alternate ways of teaching -- may pick up new ideas...leads to improvement by way of peer suggestions and comments."

"Observing my peers in their moments of strength as well as weakness reinspired me and encouraged me to try harder in my classes."

"I found the experience to be very worthwhile. Although the math department works well as a team, we have few opportunities as individuals to observe and learn from each other. The Peer Evaluation project provides this type of experience. Additionally, the project creates an opportunity for all of us to work toward professionalizing teaching."

"I enjoyed being a part of the peer evaluation process because the encouragement and suggestions I received from my evaluators were insightful and to-the-point. This was in part because my evaluators had taught the same material I was teaching and understood the material I was covering. I also enjoyed and benefitted from being able to observe my peers in their teaching."

"I liked peer evaluation because it brought the department members who had previously avoided our joint activities into that process. It enabled me to hear comments on my teaching from a different perspective than that of the department chair. It also gave me a much clearer view of what was happening in the courses in which some department members were piloting radically different texts."

"Besides the benefit of the rare occurence of watching a colleague teach, I want to comment on an important outcome that is not evaluation-related directly. Peer evaluation flies in the face of our isolation as teachers. It provides a structure in which to observe one another. After such an experience you have formed a bit of a bond with a colleague, one that allows for greater ease and frequency of conversation, more sharing at dept. meetings, a more meaningful hello in the hallway. We need more such structures that improve the communication betwee us as professionals."

"We've always talked about our teaching in this department, but peer evaluation provides a structure."

Notes

[1] In California, the venue of this study, evaluation responsibility was made a litmus test for excluding an individual from the teacher's bargaining unit. Since the passage of the collective bargaining law, the California Teachers Association (CTA), the NEA affiliate, has repeatedly fought to assure that the Mentor Teacher Program and other programs designed to promote teachers helping teachers explicitly prohibit participants' participation in the evaluation process.

[2] Throughout this paper, the terms peer evaluation and peer review refer to evaluation which contains summative elements in addition to any formative ones; "evaluation" which is purely formative is refered to as peer coaching.

[3] In Toledo, teachers who apply for the career ladder also participate in peer review.

[4] See Who will teach our children, Koppich & Kerchner, and Kerchner & Mitchell for discussions of Policy Trust Agreements.

[5] In discussing the umbrella bargaining agent in this paper, "CTA" and "CFT" should be understood, whenever appropriate, to include NEA and AFT, respectively.

[6] Those newspapers are *NEA Today*, *CTA in Action*, *American Teacher* (AFT) and *California Teacher* (CFT). AFT also publishes a quarterly journal, the American Educator, which AFT member interviewees reported reading. The only NEA/CTA publications that NEA member interviewees reported reading were the two newspapers.

[7] The mean for Arthur for question 6 just missed being significantly different from the mean for all districts for question 6 ($\alpha = .05$).

[8] QuEST is an acronym for Quality Educational Standards in Teaching.

[9] Eisenhower interviewees tended to be readers of *Phi Delta Kappan*.

[10] Subsequent to the period in which the interviews of this study were conducted, NEA has begun featuring school reform efforts (although not peer evaluation) in *NEA Today*. Whether such articles have begun to change the openness of NEA members to peer review is open to speculation.

[11] That this perception was found only amongst CTA interviewees was probably due to the sample. The relationships between the union and the district administration were worse in Arthur and McKinley than in the other four districts. In Polk and Truman, they were very good. Conversations with CFT members in districts with poor union-management relationships indicate they have similar fears.

[12] This is another view that was found in only one union because of the sample. The researcher has, on other occasions, found a similar view amongst some CTA members.

13 Those individuals indicated that they were too tired to consider *anything* new.

14 Carter dealt with this by having an administrator countersign peer evaluations.

References

Bacharach, S. B. & S. C. Conley (1986). Education Reform: A managerial agenda. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 67(9), 641-645.

Bird, T. (1985). *The Mentor's Dilemma.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

California Commission on the Teaching Profession (1985). *Who Will Teach Our Children? A Strategy for Improving California Schools.* Sacramento: Author.

Chrisco, M. (1989). Peer assistance works. *Educational Leadership,* 46 (5), 31-32.

Cresswell, A. M., M. J. Murphy, & C. T. Kerchner (1980). *Teachers, Unions, and Collective Bargaining in Public Education.* Berkeley: McCutchan.

Darling - Hammond, L. (1987). Schools for tomorrow's teachers. *Teachers College Record,* 88 (3), 354-358.

Devaney, K. (1987). *The Lead Teacher: Ways to Begin.* New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Gompers, S. (1919). *Labor and the Common Welfare.* New York: Dutton

Halkett, K. A. (1988). Rochester City School District peer assistance and review program 1986/87 local evaluation report. Rochester: Rochester City School District.

Halkett, K. A., T. Gillet, Z. Arston-Crichlow, & J. Tomm (1988). The need for, obstacles to, and gains from implementing a mentor teacher program. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New Orleans, April, 1988.

Harvard Education Letter . (1989). Good teaching: Do you know it when you see it? V(3), 1-4.

Jessup, D. K. (1985). *Teachers, Unions, and Change.* New York: Praeger.

Johnson, S. M. (1987). Can schools be reformed at the bargaining table? *Teachers College Record,* 89, 269-280.

Kerchner, C. T. & D. E. Mitchell (1988). *The Changing Idea of a Teachers' Union.* New York: Falmer Press.

Koppich, J. E., W. Gerritz, & J. W. Guthrie (1986). *A View from the Classroom: California Teachers' Opinions on Working Conditions and School Reform Proposals.* Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education.

Koppich, J. E. and C. T. Kerchner (1989). Educational policy trust agreements: Connecting labor relations and school reform. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco, March, 1989.

Lawrence, D. (1984). Teacher excellence: Teachers take charge - Dal Lawrence discusses the Toledo Plan. *American Educator,* 8 (1), 22-29.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal* , 19, 325-340.

Little, J. W. (1985). Teachers as teacher advisors: The delicacy of collegial leadership. *Educational Leadership,* 43 (3), 34-36.

Little, J. W. (1987) Teachers as colleagues. In V. Koehler (Ed.), *Educator's Handbook: A Reasearch Perspective* (pp. 491-518). New York: Longman.

Little, J. W. (1988). Assessing the Prospects for Teacher Leadership. in A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Building a Professional Culture in Schools* (pp. 78 -106). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lortie, D. C. (1986). Teacher status in Dade County: A Case of Structural Strain? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67 (8), 568-575.

McDonnell, L. M. & A. Pascal (1988). *Teacher Unions and Educational Reform.* Santa Monica: RAND.

Rancey, P. & P. Robbins (1989). Professional growth and support through peer coaching. *Educational Leadership* , 46(5), 35-38.

Rynecki, S. B. & J. H. Lindquist, (1988). Teacher evaulation and collective bargaining: A management perspective. *Journal of Law and Education,* 17, 487-506.

Strother, Deborah Burnett (1989). Peer Coaching for Teachers: Opening Classroom Doors. *Phi Delta Kappan* , 70, 824-7.

Teacher induction programs and research. (1986). *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37 (1), entire issue.

Waters, C. M. & T. L. Wyatt (1985). Toledo's Internship: The Teacher's Role in Excellence. *Phi Delta Kappan* , 66, 365-367.

Wise, A. E., L. Darling-Hammond, M. W. McLaughlin, & H. T. Bernstein (1984). *Case Studies for Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices.* Santa Monica: RAND.

Zahorik, J. (1987). Teachers' collegial interaction: An exploratory study. *Elementary School Journal*, 87 (4), 385-396.

Zerger, K. L. (1988). Teacher Evaluation and Collective Bargaining: A Union Perspective. *Journal of Law and Education* , 17, 507-525.